



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,968	12/09/2003	William R. Sweeney	021238-414	2214

21839 7590 07/13/2010
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/13/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/729,968	Applicant(s) SWEENEY, WILLIAM R.	
	Examiner AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-14,16,19-25,27,30,31,33-37,39 and 42-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14, 16, 19-25, 27, 30, 31, 33-37, 39, and 42-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 4/13/10, the following is a final office action. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 21-, 31, 33-37, 39, 42, 43, 46 are amended. Claims 2, 15, 17-18, 26, 28-29, 32, 38, 40-41 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-14, 16, 19-25, 27, 30, 31, 33-37, 39, and 42-46 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been modified to reflect claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10, 16, 31-33, 19-20, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al (US 2003/0130883 A1), and further in view of Failing, Jr. et al (US 5448226), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Werner (US 2002/0069107 A1).

As per claims 1, 31, Schroeder discloses:

the manufacturer computing device providing promotion information to be considered in developing the promotion and price computation model/receiving

Art Unit: 3628

promotion information..., ([0056], shows web interface allowing access to manufacturer computing device databases to provide alternate promotions]);

the retailer computing device providing price determination parameters to develop the promotion and price computation model/receiving price determination parameters..., ([0070], shows that a combination of conditions (sales price discount, etc.) can be input by retailer computing device to achieve targets and provide solution); and

developing in the controller that the promotion and price computation model from the promotion information provided by the manufacturer computing device and the price determination parameters provided by the retailer computing device to implement a promotion/developing the promotion and price computation model from the received promotion information..., ([0006], sales lift model, [0067], shows implementing promotions, w/ [0094], autoregressive models are based on price promotions, and [0069], shows the price offered by the manufacturer computing device in the database depends on the specific retailer computing device, incorporating existing contractual arrangements regarding pricing);

calculating in the controller a retail price based on information provided by the promotion and price computation model, (clm 25 of Schroeder shows providing a computerized sales lift model; providing a base volume estimate for the product as input for use with the computerized sales lift model; identifying a plurality of proposed promotions for the product, wherein retail price information for the product is specified for each promotion); and

Schroeder does not specifically disclose auditing of improperly implemented promotions, however, does disclose future auditing in [0110]. Here, administrators may modify database contents, enter administrative information to document changes for purposes of future auditing in the business planner system, and also in [0042], discloses support vector regression that allows the user to minimize the risk of the prediction to achieve a specified acceptable level of error.

However, Failing, Jr. et al discloses auditing of proper promotional shelf talkers as shown in col. 3, lines 14-51, and in col. 2, lines 3-11 shows that it is highly likely that some errors or omissions will occur, and even a thorough manual audit may miss some of the shelf talkers due to the quantities of changes involved and the similarity of some products, thereby suggesting that it is common to audit for errors. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Schroeder and Failing, Jr. et al to disclose auditing of improperly implemented promotions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to audit improperly implemented promotions with the motivation of determining if and when products are taken on/off promotions.

Neither Schroeder et al nor Failing, Jr. et al disclose wherein the promotion information includes a schedule that is encrypted/based on the schedule of the promotion information, wherein the retailer computing device decrypts the schedule received from the manufacturer computing device on a segment-by-segment basis such

Art Unit: 3628

that only information from a current segment is decrypted. However, Werner discloses a system for scheduling and controlling presentation of data where the system may select promotional material/data to be presented along with features, and then when a feature is encrypted, system may decrypt feature using an associated authorization key, where system is also capable of phasing out or discontinuing the presentation of a feature if the ticket sales indicate that the movie is not selling well as shown in [0044]-[0046]. Werner discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that phasing out can work in a system where the decryption of encrypted data occurs in order to gradually decipher schedule data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the promotion information includes a schedule that is encrypted/based on the schedule of the promotion information, wherein the retailer computing device decrypts the schedule received from the manufacturer computing device on a segment-by-segment basis such that only information from a current segment is decrypted with the motivation of not decrypting encrypted scheduling data all at once.

As per claims 2, 32, Schroeder discloses:

calculating a retail price based on information provided by the promotion and price computation model developed, ([0006], predicting sales).

As per claims 3, 10, 33, Schroeder discloses:

Art Unit: 3628

updating the retail price based upon additional information provided by the retailer computing device/ updating the retail price based upon additional information provided by the retailer computing device/ receiving updated promotion.../updating the retail price..., ([0083], change in price).

As per claim 4, Schroeder discloses:

wherein the additional information comprises additional promotion information provided by the manufacturer computing device, ([0072], additional/extended promotion).

As per claims 5, 33, Schroeder discloses:

wherein the additional information comprises additional price determination parameters provided by the retailer computing device, ([0029], cost of retailer computing device fees).

As per claims 6-8, Schroeder discloses:

wherein the step of updating comprises performing real-time updates of the retail price based upon the additional information, wherein the additional information comprises information received at the controller on a real-time basis/wherein the information received on a real-time basis comprises real-time promotion information received from the manufacturer computing device/wherein the information received on a real-time basis comprises real-time price determination parameters received from the retailer computing device, ([0075], shows transactions can be handled via real-time authorization).

As per claim 9, Schroeder discloses:

displaying the retail price on a retail display device, ([0106], retailer computing device information displayed).

As per claim 16, Schroeder discloses:

wherein the promotion schedule is stored in a table, ([0077], manufacturer computing device view).

As per claims 44, 46 Schroeder does not specifically disclose the following, however Failing, Jr. et al discloses, that audit reports may be automatic or manual. Remote audits, such as from corporate headquarters, may be conducted through the communications means already in place to provide price change information in col. 3, lines 42-46.

It therefore would be obvious to combine the teaching of Schroeder and Failing, Jr. et al to disclose further comprising the retailer computing device bypassing the promotion and price computation model and manually setting the retail price/further comprising the retailer computing device bypassing the promotion mid price computation model and manually setting the retail price.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose the above limitation with the motivation of optionally using manual intervention to set retail prices.

As per claims 19-20, 42-43, neither Schroeder et al nor Failing, Jr. et al disclose wherein the decryption on a segment-by-segment basis occurs according to a segment selected from the group consisting of: a time segment, a date segment, and a *promotion*

Art Unit: 3628

type segment/wherein the decryption occurs by way of decryption keys for each segment that are passed to the retailer computing device on a just-in-time basis.

However, Werner discloses a system for scheduling and controlling presentation of data where the system may select promotional material/data to be presented along with features, and then when a feature is encrypted, system may decrypt feature using an associated authorization key, where system is also capable of phasing out or discontinuing the presentation of a feature if the ticket sales indicate that the movie is not selling well as shown in [0044]-[0046]. Also, specifically in [0045], Werner discloses that where feature is encrypted, system may decrypt feature using an associated authorization key, or transfer the authorization key with feature 44 to a data presentation unit for decryption, and that the system may perform such processing before the scheduled presentation or on-the-fly as data is transferred to a data presentation unit. Werner discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that phasing out can work in a system where the decryption of encrypted data occurs in order to gradually decipher schedule data, and that data can be decrypted during a specific time frame.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the decryption on a segment-by-segment basis occurs according to a segment selected from the group consisting of: a time segment, a date segment, and a promotion type segment/wherein the decryption occurs by way of decryption keys for each segment that are passed to the

Art Unit: 3628

retailer computing device on a just-in-time basis with the motivation of not decrypting encrypted scheduling data based on promotion all at once, but during a specific frame.

As per claim 45, Schroeder discloses:

wherein the system determines whether a promotion has been improperly implemented on the basis of a contract violation, ([0042], shows support vector regression, a recent development in regression practice, allows the user to minimize the risk of the prediction to achieve a specified acceptable level of error).

4. Claims 21-25, 27, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teicher et al (US 5,933,813), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Failing, Jr. et al (US 5448226), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Werner (US 2002/0069107 A1).

As per claim 21, Teicher et al discloses:

A sales controller in communication with a retailer computing device and a manufacturer computing device, (col. 5, lines 34-54, sales controller represented by the POS bar code reader);

a sales device in communication with the retailer computing device and the sales controller, (col. 5, lines 34-54, sales device represented by the POS unit);

wherein the sales controller is configured to receive promotion information from the manufacturer computing device and price determination parameters from the retailer computing device to calculate a retail price and implement a promotion, /and wherein the sales device is configured to receive the retail price from the sales controller (col. 5,

Art Unit: 3628

lines 34-54, calculates new price, [0069], shows the price offered by the manufacturer computing device in the database depends on the specific retailer computing device, incorporating existing contractual arrangements regarding pricing);

Teicher et al does not specifically disclose implementing a promotion or wherein the sales controller is configured to audit improperly implemented promotions and send audit reports to the manufacturer computing device, however does disclose determining and displaying sales promotion prices in col. 1, lines 36-51, which suggests ultimately implementing promotions.

However, Failing, Jr. et al discloses auditing of proper promotional shelf talkers as shown in col. 3, lines 14-51, and in col. 2, lines 3-11 shows that it is highly likely that some errors or omissions will occur, and even a thorough manual audit may miss some of the shelf talkers due to the quantities of changes involved and the similarity of some products, thereby suggesting that it is common to audit for errors. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Schroeder and Failing, Jr. et al to disclose auditing of improperly implemented promotions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to audit improperly implemented promotions with the motivation of determining if and when products are taken on/off promotions.

Neither Teicher et al nor Failing, Jr. et al disclose wherein the promotion information includes a promotion schedule that is encrypted at the manufacturer computing device,

Art Unit: 3628

and the sales controller decrypts the promotion schedule on a segment-by-segment basis such that only information from a current segment is decrypted. However, Werner discloses a system for scheduling and controlling presentation of data where the system may select promotional material/data to be presented along with features, and then when a feature is encrypted, system may decrypt feature using an associated authorization key, where system is also capable of phasing out or discontinuing the presentation of a feature if the ticket sales indicate that the movie is not selling well as shown in [0044]-[0046]. Werner discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that phasing out can work in a system where the decryption of encrypted data occurs in order to gradually decipher schedule data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the promotion information includes a promotion schedule that is encrypted at the manufacturer computing device, and the sales controller decrypts the promotion schedule on a segment-by-segment basis such that only information from a current segment is decrypted with the motivation of not decrypting encrypted scheduling data all at once.

As per claim 22, Teicher et al discloses:

further comprising a display controller configured to control a plurality of display devices for displaying the retail price, (Col 1, lines 49-51, data processor controls display).

As per claim 23, Teicher et al discloses:

further comprising at least one display device for displaying the retail price communicated from the display controller, (col. 1, lines 49-51, electronic displays).

As per claim 24, Teicher et al discloses:

further comprising a look-up table generated by the sales controller for indicating the retail price to be displayed by the at least one display device, (col. 4, lines 22-27, list of price reductions).

As per claim 25, Teicher et al discloses:

wherein the sales device comprises a point-of-sale (POS) device that accesses the look-up table to determine the retail price to charge, (Col. 4, lines 22-27, POS unit).

As per claim 27, Teicher et al discloses:

wherein the promotion schedule is stored in a table, (col. 4, lines 22-27, list of price reductions).

As per claim 30, neither Teicher et al nor Failing, Jr. et al disclose wherein the promotion schedule may be decrypted by decryption keys received by the sales controller on a just-in time basis. However, in [0045], Werner discloses that where feature is encrypted, system may decrypt feature using an associated authorization key, or transfer the authorization key with feature 44 to a data presentation unit for decryption, and that the system may perform such processing before the scheduled presentation or on-the-fly as data is transferred to a data presentation unit. Werner discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that data can be decrypted during a specific time frame.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to disclose wherein the promotion schedule may be decrypted by decryption keys received by the sales controller on a just-in time basis with the motivation of not decrypting encrypted scheduling data based on promotion all at once, but during a specific frame.

5. Claims 11-14, 34-37, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al (US 2003/0130883 A1), and further in view of Failing, Jr. et al (US 5448226), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Werner (US 2002/0069107 A1), and further in view of Teicher et al (US 5,933,813), as cited by applicant.

As per claim 11, neither Schroeder et al nor Failing, Jr. et al nor Werner disclose the following, but does disclose updating the retail price through a display in [0106].

However, Teicher et al discloses:

wherein the step of updating is performed automatically in response to either additional promotion information provided by the manufacturer computing device or additional price determination parameters provided by the retailer computing device, (Col. 9, lines 58-69, "updated prices" command received automatically). Teicher et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of initiating a simultaneous, global change in the contents of the display.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to perform updating automatically with the motivation of updating without physical interaction.

As per claim 12, Schroeder et al discloses:
wherein the step of automatically updating is performed on a real-time basis, ([0075], shows transactions can be handled via real-time authorization).

As per claim 13, neither Schroeder et al nor Failing et al nor Werner disclose the following, but does disclose updating the retail price through a display in [0106].

However, Teicher et al discloses:

wherein the automatically updated retail price is passed to a look up table accessible to display devices and point-of-sale devices, (col. 4, lines 6-27, list of price reductions). Teicher et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that price reductions are listed as a source for updating the current price.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to automatically update the retail price according to a look-up table with the motivation of accessing a source to get current prices.

As per claims 14, 34, neither Schroeder et al, Failing et al, nor Werner nor Teicher et al disclose the following, but Schroeder et al does disclose updating the retail price through a display in [0106].

Therefore, the following is obvious with the Schroeder et al/Failing et al/Werner/Teicher et al combination since updates are stored at the computer in Schroeder:

Art Unit: 3628

wherein the automatically updated retail price is passed directly to display devices and point-of-sale devices/ further comprising the step of: providing the updated price to a display controller and a sales controller.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the automatically updated retail price to be passed directly to a display device and point-of-sale devices with the motivation of using stored data to update prices.

As per claim 35, Schroeder et al discloses:

wherein the steps of updating and providing are performed on an as-needed basis, ([0102], as-needed).

As per claim 36, Schroeder et al discloses:

wherein the steps of updating and providing are performed upon request.
([0066], request for the modification of sales plans)

As per claim 37, Schroeder et al discloses:

wherein the steps of updating and providing are performed on a real-time basis, ([0075], real-time).

As per claim 39, Schroeder et al discloses:

wherein the promotion schedule is stored in a table, ([0077], manufacturer computing device view).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/13/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that prior art does not disclose or suggest the calculation of a retail price as recited in amended claims 1 and 31. However, as now shown in the rejection, clm 25 of Schroeder shows "providing a computerized sales lift model; providing a base volume estimate for the product as input for use with the computerized sales lift model; identifying a plurality of proposed promotions for the product, wherein retail price information for the product is specified for each promotion". In this case, retail price information for the product is calculated as a result of promotion and sales lift, which includes price as shown in claim 32 of Schroeder, where it is shown that the model of sales lift of the product capable of predicting the effect on consumer sales of a plurality of promotion types as modeled as function of at least the change in effective price to the consumer due to the promotion.

As per claim 21, applicant argues that *Teicher* discloses that the computer system (controller) is in communication with a retailer (merchant or point of sale sensors), but does not disclose or suggest that the system is in communication with a manufacturer that provides promotion information to the controller. However, in Col. 5, lines 39-43 of *Teicher*, it is shown that "'BASIC PRICE" is the price charged for the respective item if its price is not to be reduced; it is determined separately by the merchant, and may include preliminary price reduction, for instance, under seasonal or

Art Unit: 3628

manufacturer-promoted Sales”, thereby suggesting that the computer system of Teicher is in some form, in communication with a manufacturer that provides promotion information since the manufacturer-promoted Sales is being included in the price reduction for a respective item.

Claims 11-14, 34-37, and 39 depend from claims 1 and 31 and are still rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3628

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

A. R. B.
July 12, 2010

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628